UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,314	01/25/2005	Takashi Ono	03500.017422.	5994

5514   7590   04/01/2010
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
KASSA, HILINA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 January 2010*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8 and 10* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6, 8 and 10* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment submitted on 01/05/2010 has been acknowledged. Claims 1-6,

8, 10 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 01/05/10 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

(1) argument 1:

Applicant argues that Lam et al. does not reach or disclose a number of IP

addresses provided is equal to a number of mage processing functions.

With respect to Applicant's argument, and as best understood by the Examiner

Lam et al. teaches in ¶ **[0016], lines 10-15; each of the devices connected to**

the router corresponds with IP address generated i.e. equal number. Thus,

as further clarification is requested, the stated argument is not persuasive.

(2) argument 2:

Applicant argues a combination of Lain et al., Thomson et al., and Dathathraya,

would fail to teach that a controller operable to communicate with a plurality of

appliances on the network using the IP addresses generated for the plurality of

image processing functions and operate each of the plurality of image processing

functions to execute communications between each of the plurality of image

processing functions and at least one of the plurality of appliances, and to

execute a transfer task for transferring packet data, wherein the transfer task for

transferring packet data is managed by an OS using buffer areas allocated to the

printer function and the scanner function.

With respect to Applicant's argument, Lam et al. disclosed a controller operable

to communicate with a plurality of appliances on the network by using the IP

addresses generated for the plurality of image processing functions (¶ **[0036],

lines 1-7; note that the central processing unit communicates with each

peripheral device via the unique IP address assigned to each device**) and

operate each of the plurality of image processing functions via a common bus to

execute communications between each of the plurality of image processing

functions and at least one of the plurality of appliances (¶ **[0037], lines 1-7; note

that IP address identification information allows multiple peripheral

devices designed to be connected to a single local interface to be identified

and utilized. In the example above, serial device 78 may be a modem or a

printer. The modem and printer each have a unique IP address to allow

CPU 62 to communicate with the serial device currently connected**), and to

execute a transfer task for transferring packet data (¶ **[0037], lines 16-17; note

that the interface 70 routes the information to the appropriate target**

peripheral utilizing the IP address associated with the packet) wherein the

transfer task for *transferring packet data is managed by an OS* using buffer areas

allocated to the printer function and the scanner function, respectively (**¶ [0038],**

lines 1-13; note that memory 64 has a lookup table/buffer that allocates a

unique IP corresponding to the port number) and Dathathraya teaches a

composite image processing apparatus and transferring packet data is managed

by an OS (**column 7, lines 1-12; note that a MFP is disclosed and an OS is**

utilized as the system to manage the workflow). Thus, the stated argument is

not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites, "… wherein each of the IP address

is unique to a different one of the plurality of image processing function, and wherein *a*

number of the plurality of IP addresses is equal to a number of the plurality of image

processing functions". First, it is not clear if the IP address is related to the device or

functionalities of the devices with in the MFP i.e. the printing, scanning and facsimile. If

such is the case, the IP addresses generate should relate with the specific functionality

of the device i.e. the printer or scanner. As stated in the preamble, the image

processing functions including a printer function and a scanner function, such function is

merely related to the printer and scanner. Thus, clarification is respectfully requested.

Second, it is not clear if the IP address is related to the functionality of each device with

in the MFP. i.e. if the functionality is related with the printer, having multiple functions of

the printer is also taken under consideration such as RIP function, image receiving

function, image transmitting function, or image storing function etc. In this scenario, it is

not clear if the IP addresses generated are equal to the functions of the printer. Thus,

clarification is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 8 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Lam et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0142683 A1) and Thomson et al.

(Request for comments 2462 IPv6 Stateless Autoconfiguration", The Internet

Engineering Task Force (IETF)(online), December 1998) and further in view of

Dathathraya (US Patent Number 6,934,932 B2).

    (1) regarding claim 1:

As shown in 2, Lam et al. discloses a composite image processing apparatus for performing a plurality of image processing functions, including a printer function and a scanner function (**52, 54, ¶ [0035], lines 5-9; note that various devices with multiple functions**), the apparatus comprising:

generate an IP address unique to a different one of the plurality of image processing functions based on the repeatedly acquired prefix information (**¶ [0036], lines 1-14; note that a unique IP address gets assigned for each device on the basis of the router**); and wherein a number of the plurality of IP addresses is equal to a number to the plurality of image processing function (**¶ [0016], lines 10-15; note that each of the devices connected to the router corresponds with IP address generated i.e. equal number**);

a controller operable to communicate with a plurality of appliances on the network by using the IP addresses generated for the plurality of image processing functions (**¶ [0036], lines 1-7; note that the central processing unit communicates with each peripheral device via the unique IP address assigned to each device**) and operate each of the plurality of image processing functions via a common bus to execute communications between each of the plurality of image processing functions and at least one of the plurality of appliances (**¶ [0037], lines 1-7; note that IP address identification information allows multiple peripheral devices designed to be connected to a single local interface to be identified and utilized. In the example above, serial device 78 may be a modem or a printer. The modem and printer each have a unique IP address to allow CPU 62 to communicate with the**

serial device currently connected), and to execute a transfer task for transferring

packet data (¶ **[0037], lines 16-17; note that the interface 70 routes the information

to the appropriate target peripheral utilizing the IP address associated with the

packet**),

wherein the transfer task for transferring packet data is managed by an OS using

buffer areas allocated to the printer function and the scanner function, respectively (¶

**[0038], lines 1-13; note that memory 64 has a lookup table/buffer that allocates a

unique IP corresponding to the port number**).

Lam et al. discloses most of the subject matter as described as above except for

specifically teaching an IP address generator, connected to an IPv6 router on a

network, operable to repeatedly acquire prefix information from the IPv6 router.

However, Nikander teaches an IP address generator, connected to an IPv6

router on a network, operable to repeatedly acquire prefix information from the IPv6

router (**page 2, ¶ [0002] of Introduction; note that IPv6 defines an auto

configuration mechanism of routers. Also, the stateless mechanism allows a host

to generate its own address using a combination of locally available information

provided by the routers. Also, page 3 ¶ [0004] such configuration is made

automatically with a detection of duplicate address i.e. repeatedly acquiring

prefix**).

Lam et al. and Thomson et al. are combinable because they are from the same

field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skilled in the art to have an IP address generator, connected to an IPv6 router

on a network, operable to repeatedly acquire prefix information from the IPv6 router.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that IPv6 addresses lease to

an interface for a fixed length of time (page 3, paragraph [0002], lines 1-5) and IPv6

defines both stateful and stateless address autconfiguration mechanism (page 2,

paragraph [0002], lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lam et

al. with Thomson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Lam et al. and Thomson et al. disclose most of the subject matter as described

as above except for specifically teaching a composite image processing apparatus and

transferring packet data is managed by an OS.

However, Dathathraya teaches a composite image processing apparatus and

transferring packet data is managed by an OS (**column 7, lines 1-12; note that a MFP**

is disclosed and an OS is utilized as the system to manage the workflow).

Lam et al., Thomson et al. and Dathathraya are combinable because they are

from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have a composite image processing

apparatus and transferring packet data is managed by an OS. The

suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently manage workflow

using a plurality of scripts in MFP system (abstract, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to combine Lam et al., Thomson et al. with Dathathraya to obtain the

invention as specified in claim 1.

(2) regarding claim 8:

Lam et al. further disclose the composite apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the IP address generator means sends each generated IP address to the router to check for duplication of the IP address (**paragraph [0038], lines 4-16; note that the unique IP address of the peripherals gets stored as a simple look up table, if change or addition needs to be made, a new IP gets generated**), and, if the IP address is a duplicate (**paragraph [0038], lines 8-9; note that if the IP address needs to be changed or added, a new IP gets generated**), the IP address generator generates an IP address different from the duplicate IP address based on the prefix information (**paragraph [0040], lines 3-22**).

7.   The proposed combination of Lam et al., Thomson et al. with Dathathraya, explained in the rejection of apparatus claim 1, renders obvious the steps of the method of claim 3 and the computer-readable medium claim 5 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 3 and 5.

8.   The proposed combination of Lam et al., Thomson et al. with Dathathraya, explained in the rejection of apparatus claim 8, renders obvious the steps of the method of claim 10 because these steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claim 8 are equally applicable to claim 10.

9. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lam et al. (US Publication Number 2003/0142683 A1), Thomson et al. (Request for comments 2462 IPv6 Stateless Autoconfiguration", The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)(online), December 1998), Dathathraya (US Patent Number 6,934,932 B2) and further in view of Ouchi (US Patent Number 5,987,494, see IDS).

(1) regarding claim 2:

Lam et al. disclose control means performs the communicating using the IP addresses generated for the plurality of image processing functions based on the control task program **(paragraph [0036], lines 3-8; note that central processing unit communicates between each peripheral devises via the IP addresses that is assigned)**.

Lam et al. Thomson et al. and Dathathraya disclose most of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the controller executes the plurality of image processing functions by executing, on a time-division basis using a task switchover, control task programs corresponding respectively to the plurality of image processing functions, and taking as a unit a control task program corresponding to an image processing function of the plurality of image processing functions.

However, Ouchi discloses wherein the controller executes the plurality of image processing functions by executing, on a time-division basis using a task switchover **(column 4, lines 9-15; note that control program has a timer to switchover tasks**

on every 1/60 seconds), control task programs corresponding respectively to the

plurality of image processing functions (**column 4, lines 15-29; note that the control**

program, which is corresponding to a plurality of functions, on the basis of the

timer), and taking as a unit a control task program corresponding to an image

processing function of the plurality of image processing functions (**column 5, lines 27-**

40; note that control programs correspond to the plurality of functions of the

multi-functional processing device).

Lam et al., Thomson et al., Dathathraya and Ouchi are combinable because they

are from the same field of endeavor i.e. data processing for MFP. At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein

the controller executes the plurality of image processing functions by executing, on a

time-division basis using a task switchover, control task programs corresponding

respectively to the plurality of image processing functions, and taking as a unit a control

task program corresponding to an image processing function of the plurality of image

processing functions. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order

to concurrently process a plurality of control programs using time sharing methods

(column 1, lines 5-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lam et al.,

Thomson et al., Dathathraya and Ouchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

10.   The proposed combination of Lam et al., Thomson et al., Dathathraya and

Ouchi, explained in the rejection of apparatus claim 2, renders obvious the steps of the

method of claim 4 and the computer-readable medium claim 6 because these

steps occur in the operation of the proposed combination as discussed above. Thus, the arguments similar to that presented above for claim 2 are equally applicable to claims 4 and 6.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Moore could be reached at (571) 272- 7437. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about PAIR system, see http://pari-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hilina S Kassa/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

March 29, 2010

/Twyler L. Haskins/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625